

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 3 are supported at least at page 26, line 20, to page 27, line 21, of the Specification.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5 and 6¹ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proehl *et al* (US 6,477,350) ["Proehl"]. (of record) in view of Lemmons (US 6,481,011) ["Lemmons"]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a program guide displaying apparatus that comprises "a range displaying device for displaying a program table range to be displayed in the second display mode in such a manner that the program table range is superimposed on a program table displayed in the first display mode ... [and] wherein the program guide displaying apparatus further comprises a mode specifying device for receiving an instruction to change the program table range between the first display mode and the second display mode, and wherein the range displaying device changes the program table range between the first display mode and the second display mode in response to the instruction by received by the mode specifying device." (emphasis added.) The Examiner contends that Proehl discloses the claimed range displaying device. Specifically the Examiner contends that time bar area 1012 of Proehl corresponds to the claimed range displaying device.

¹ Applicant notes that the Office Action header lists claims 1-4, but the body of the rejection has claims 1, 3, 5 and 6.

The Examiner also contends that step 1040 in Fig. 10 illustrates the claimed displaying of the program range table on the first display and that step 1010 in Fig. 10 illustrates the claimed displaying of the program range table on the second display. Office Action at page 3.

Proehl merely discloses that the first level of EPG is displayed at step 1010 and that the EPG can be zoomed to the level at step 1040 (col. 7, lines 33-49, Fig. 10). There is no disclosure or suggestion that the display mode at step 1040 is superimposed on the display mode at step 1010.

After zooming, a user of the Proehl device would not be able to easily understand which range was enlarged since the user would not be able to compare the second level of EPG at step 1040 and the first level of EPG at step 1010 at the same time. However, as set forth in claim 1, the claimed program guide displaying apparatus provides a program table range to be displayed in the second display mode that is superimposed on a program table displayed in the first display mode, and the program table range can be alternately changed between the first display mode and the second display mode. Accordingly, the user can easily understand which range is enlarged. Therefore, Applicants submit that the claimed range specifying device is patentably distinct from the disclosure in Proehl.

Applicant submits that Lemmons does not disclose at least the displaying of a program table range in the second display mode in such a manner that the program table range is superimposed on a program table displayed in the first display mode. Therefore, Proehl and Lemmons (taken alone or in combination) do not disclose or suggest at least the claimed range specifying device with the claimed mode specifying device as set forth in claim 1.

In addition, Applicant submits that Proehl's disclosure merely indicates that the first level of EPG at step 1010 is zoomed to the second level of EPG at step 1040. At step 1040, time bar area 1402 has a greater time range than the first level of step 1010. The span of the time bar area 1402 depends on a user's zooming operation. Applicant submits that it would be very difficult to alternately display the first level of EPG at step 1010 and the second level of EPG. Further, it would be very difficult to change the EPG between the first level and the second level with respect to time ranges recited in claim 1 because the user would have to perform zooming operations repeatedly.

On the other hand, in the present invention as set forth in claim 1, a mode specifying device receives an instruction to change the program table range between the first display mode and the second display mode. Further, the range displaying device changes the program table range between the first display mode and the second display mode in response to the instruction by received by the mode specifying device. Therefore, the claimed mode specifying device has patentable advantages since a user can easily and quickly change the program table between the first display mode and the second display mode without performing zooming operation.

Claim 3 recites a program guide displaying method that comprises "a range displaying process of displaying a program table range to be displayed in the second display mode in such a manner that the program table range is superimposed on a program table displayed in the first display mode ... wherein the program guide displaying method further comprises a mode specifying process of receiving an instruction to change the program table range between the first display mode and the second display mode, and wherein the range displaying process changes

the program table range between the first display mode and the second display mode in response to the instruction by received by the mode specifying process.”

Because claim 3 recites features analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable for at least reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that claims 5 and 6 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proehl in view of Lemmons, and further in view Takahashi *et al.*, (US 6,344,880) [“Takahashi”]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that Takahashi does not disclose or suggest the claimed superimposing as described above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Accordingly, Takahashi does not cure the deficient teachings of Proehl and Lemmons given above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 4 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

In addition, as clearly described in line 2 on page 32 through in line 15 on page 33 of the specification, the present invention can change a display mode from a whole display mode (the first display mode) to a day-of-week display EPG (the second display mode) or from the whole display mode (the first display mode) to the pop-up display (the third display mode). These features are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in any of the references.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Bhaskar Kakarla
Registration No. 54,627

Date: December 6, 2005